

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed May 2, 2008. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the Examiner's careful review and consideration of this application.

In the subject Action, claims 1 and 3-8 were rejected. Claims 1, 3, and 4 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The subject matter from claim 4 has been incorporated into claims 5 and 6 respectively. Therefore, claims 5-8 remain pending in the present application. Consideration of this Amendment and Response After Final is proper since no new claims have been added and no new issues have been raised.

In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and advancement of this application to allowance.

**Rejection Under § 103 (AAPA in view of Kang)**

In section 3 of the Action, claims 1 and 3 were rejected under §103(a) as being obvious over Applicant Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of Kang (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0058194). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to advance prosecution, claims 1 and 3 have been canceled above (Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection). In view of the cancellation, the rejection is now moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

**Rejection Under § 103 (AAPA in view of Kim et al.)**

In section 4 of the Action, claims 4-8 were rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over AAPA in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0160569). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

First, as noted above, claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and the subject matter from claim 4 has been incorporated into both claims 5 and 6.

Second, claim 5 recites, "a third common electrode connected to one of the first common electrode and the second common electrode in an opposite position where a scan signal is applied to the scan electrode, and extended to the position whereto the scan signal is applied." In

contrast, neither AAPA nor Kim et al. discloses such a limitation. In fact, the Office Action acknowledges that AAPA as modified by Kim et al. does not teach a third common electrode connected to one of the first common electrode and the second common electrode.

Further, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention that the recited limitation "is an obvious design choice . . . in order to further improve display quality." In fact, there are advantages which flow from the limitation, including that the separate sustain driver circuit can then be installed at one end of a unit PDP which is not interconnected with a different unit PDP. Further, although it is installed at one end of the unit PDP, a sustain signal can be applied to both ends of the sustain electrodes by the third common electrode. Thus, the combination is not merely an obvious design choice.

Still further, there is no suggestion or motivation in AAPA or Kim et al. or other cited references to suggest Applicants' recited invention. For example, Kim et al. discloses the driving circuits 100 and 100' which supply the sustain voltage installed at both ends of the PDP 10 symmetrically. See Kim et al., § 0026; Fig. 3. The driving circuits 100 and 100' disclosed in Kim et al. are formed outside of the PDP. The driving circuits 100 and 100' must be installed respectively at the both ends of the PDP 10. Thus, it is not an obvious design choice to make a plasma display panel comprising a third common electrode connected to one of the first common electrode and the second common electrode in an opposite position where a scan signal is applied to the scan electrode, and extended to the position whereto the scan signal is applied.

In view of the foregoing, even if it is proper to combine the cited references (which point Applicants do not concede), the combination fails to disclose or suggest all limitations of claim 5. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 5, as well as claim 7 that depends therefrom, are respectfully requested for at least these reasons.

Third, claim 6 recites a third common electrode for connecting the first common electrode and the second common electrode each other. Claim 6 is therefore allowable for at least similar reasons to those provided above with respect to claim 5. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 6, as well as claim 8 that depends therefrom, are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

This response is believed to be responsive to all points raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the currently pending claims. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney at 612.336.4755 to discuss the same.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date:

24 July 2008

By:

Name: Brian H. Batzli  
Reg. No.: 32,960